

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending, including independent claims 1 and 7. All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over USP 6,496,205 ("White") and USP 6,606,465 ("Mutoh").

Applicant's claimed invention is directed to a method and apparatus for displaying a menu on a screen, where the menu items correspond to functions that can be executing by selecting a menu item. If it is determined that a function corresponding to a displayed menu item cannot be executed, that menu item is disabled from being selected, and a reason why the menu item cannot be selected is displayed. With this invention, a user can easily understand why a particular function cannot be executed, and the user does not become confused or think the device is broken when it is not (see the application at, e.g., p. 6, line 28 to p. 7, line 9; p. 8, lines 15-26).

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejection. White is directed to a user interface for controlling audio functions in a web browser. If audio data is available to be played, an audio panel 154 is displayed on the screen and includes software buttons for controlling the audio data (see Fig. 8B). If no audio data is available to be played, the audio panel 154 simply is not displayed. (See, e.g., col. 14, line 66 to col. 15, line 53.) As the Examiner notes, White does not display a reason explaining why a function cannot be selected.


The Examiner contends that Mutoh displays a reason why a menu item cannot be selected, but Applicant disagrees. The Figure and passage relied on by the Examiner (Figs. 5A-D; col. 10, lines 24-40) only vaguely suggest that the facsimile transmission function of the equipment is not available (see display area 32c in Fig. 5D; col. 10, lines 40-50), i.e., only that the function is disabled. Mutoh, like White, does not describe or suggest that a reason is displayed to explain why the function cannot be selected. Thus, there is the possibility that the user becomes frustrated and confused because he/she does not know why the function is disabled and may wrongly think the equipment is broken.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons stated above for the independent claims. In addition, neither of the cited references relates to or

suggests a navigation apparatus as recited in dependent claim 6. Applicant has amended claim 6 to clarify that the apparatus is a "map navigation apparatus."

In summary, Applicant submits that the claims are patentable over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,


James P. Naughton
Registration No. 30,665
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200